Exhibit B

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 2 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

מדרבר מידרותו	Page 1
ONTIED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISC	O DIVISION
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.	No. CV 10-03561 WHA
GOOGLE, INC.,	
Defendant.)	
)	
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITI	ON OF ROBERT GRIESEMER
THURSDAY,	JUNE 23, 2011
	JUNE 23, 2011
THURSDAY,	JUNE 23, 2011
	JUNE 23, 2011
	JUNE 23, 2011

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 3 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

```
Page 2
 1
 2
 8
           Videotaped Deposition of ROBERT GRIESEMER,
 9
           taken at 333 Twin Dolphin Drive, 4th Floor,
10
           Redwood Shores, California, commencing
11
           at 9:32 p.m., Thursday, June 23, 2011,
12
           before Kelli Combs, CSR No. 7705.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCE OF COUNSEL:
2	
3	FOR PLAINTIFF ORACLE AMERICA, INC.:
4	
5	MORRISON & FOERSTER
6	BY: MICHAEL A. JACOBS, ESQ.
7	JESSICA TIPTON, ESQ. (Palo Alto office)
8	ADELA GOTZ, Summer Associate
9	425 Market Street
10	San Francisco, California 94105-2482
11	(415) 268-7455
12	mjacobs@mofo.com
13	jtipton@mofo.com
14	
15	FOR DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.:
16	
17	KING & SPALDING
18	BY: MARK FRANCIS, ESQ.
19	BRUCE W. BABER, ESQ. (Atlanta, Georgia office)
20	1185 Avenue of the Americas
21	New York, New York 10036-4003
22	(212) 556-2227
23	mfrancis@kslaw.com
24	bbaber@kslaw.com
25	

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 5 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 4	
1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL CONTINUED:		
2			
3	FOR THE WITNESS:		
4			
5	KRIEG, KELLER, SLOAN, REILLEY & ROMAN,	LLP	
6	BY: GARTH A. ROSENGREN, ESQ.		
7	555 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor		
8	San Francisco, California 94111		
9	(415) 249-8330		
10	grosengren@kksrr.com		
11			
12	ALSO PRESENT:		
13			
14	NICK KASAMATIS, videographer		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 6 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 5
1	ROBERT GRIESEMER,	
2	after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:	
3	000	
4		
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We're	9:32AM
6	on the record at 9:32 on June 23rd, 2011.	
7	This is the videotaped deposition of	
8	Robert Griesemer. My name is Nick Kasamatis, here	
9	with our court reporter, Kelli Combs. We are here	
10	from Veritext National Deposition & Litigation	9:33AM
11	Services at the request of counsel for Plaintiff.	
12	This deposition is being held at King &	
13	Spalding, 333 Twin Dolphin Drive in the City of	
14	Redwood Shores.	
15	The caption of this case is Oracle of	9:33AM
16	America versus Google, Inc., Case Number CV 10-03561	
17	WHA.	
18	Please note that audio and video recording	
19	will take place unless all parties agree to go off	
20	the record. Microphones are sensitive and may pick	9:33AM
21	up whispers, private conversations, and cellular	
22	interference.	
23	At this time, will counsel and all present	
24	please identify themselves for the record.	
25	MR. JACOBS: Michael Jacobs, Morrison &	9:33AM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 7 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 175
1	policies at Sun that specifically related to	2:38PM
2	retention by Sun of, for example, notebooks of	
3	individuals who had been named as inventors on any	
4	patents?	
5	A I don't remember.	2:38PM
6	Q Okay.	
7	I'd like to go back to some of your	
8	earlier testimony, Mr. Griesemer, about the '205	
9	patent, so if you could get it back in front of you.	
10	It's PX164.	2:38PM
11	And I just want to be sure that the	
12	testimony you have given is clear for both The Court	
13	and a jury to the extent they ever hear your	
14	testimony about this patent.	
15	In response to Mr. Jacobs' questions, you	2:39PM
16	identified at least three different techniques for	
17	optimizing performance of a virtual machine,	
18	correct?	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q One of them was the so-called snippet	2:39PM
21	technique that is described in the '205 patent,	
22	correct?	
23	A Correct.	
24	Q You also testified to some length about	
25	in-line caching, correct?	2:39PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 8 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 176
1	A Correct.	2:39PM
2	Q And you also testified about something	
3	called on-stack replacement, correct?	
4	A Correct.	
5	Q I'd like you to go back in time with me	2:39PM
6	for a second to the time when you were working at	
7	Animorphic and then when you were working at Sun, up	
8	until the time the first patent application that	
9	became the '205 patent was filed, which would be	
10	June 30th of 1997, okay?	2:39PM
11	A Yes.	
12	Q The timeframe I want to focus on is your	
13	time at Animorphic up until June 30th, 1997 at Sun,	
14	okay?	
15	A Yes.	2:39PM
16	Q During that time period, do you believe	
17	that what you came up with in terms of the snippet	
18	technique was something new?	
19	A I must have, but I don't recall.	
20	Q Okay.	2:40PM
21	During that same time period, do you	
22	believe that you came up with anything new that	
23	related to techniques for in-line caching?	
24	A They were very, very platform-specific	
25	variations of it.	2:40PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 9 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 177
1	Q When you say "platform-specific	2:40PM
2	variations," what do you mean?	
3	A I found that on the X86 platform, you	
4	could use an instruction that was not doing	
5	anything, so to speak, in the code to store to	2:40PM
6	store some in-line cache information.	
7	Q Okay.	
8	And during that same time period we're	
9	talking about now, your Animorphic days and then	
10	through June 30th of 1997 at Sun, do you believe you	2:41PM
11	came up with anything new with respect to on-stack	
12	replacement?	
13	A I don't recall.	
14	Q Okay.	
15	And now I'd like you to look at the '205	2:41PM
16	patent.	
17	The '205 patent does describe and explains	
18	the snippet technique, correct?	
19	A Correct.	
20	Q And it describes the snippet technique	2:41PM
21	both can be used with in-line caching and without	
22	in-line caching, correct?	
23	A Correct.	
24	Q Okay.	
25	You mentioned a few minutes ago some very	2:41PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 10 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 178
1	specific platform-specific techniques for in-line	2:41PM
2	caching that you believe you developed during those	
3	days.	
4	Are any of those platform-specific	
5	techniques for in-line caching described in the '205	2:41PM
6	patent?	
7	A I believe they are not.	
8	Q Okay.	
9	And do you believe that any techniques	
10	that you were using or came up with for on-stack	2:41PM
11	replacement during that time period are described in	
12	the '205 patent?	
13	A No.	
14	Q Okay.	
15	I believe you also testified that at one	2:42PM
16	point, there was a use in the HotSpot Virtual	
17	Machine of the snippet technique that's described in	
18	the '205 patent, correct?	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q And if I recall, your testimony is you're	2:42PM
21	not sure when that was taken out, whether it was	
22	still at Animorphic or whether it was at Sun; is	
23	that right?	
24	A Correct.	
25	Q Okay.	2:42PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 11 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 179
1	If you had available to you today the	2:42PM
2	source code for the HotSpot Virtual Machine going	
3	back into that time period, would it be easy or	
4	difficult for you to determine when the snippet	
5	technique was discontinued?	2:42PM
6	A It would be very easy.	
7	Q How would you do it?	
8	A There in this patent, there is a	
9	specific bytecode described. It's called go_native,	
10	which was used to invoke those snippets.	2:42PM
11	In the HotSpot Virtual Machine, there is a	
12	table of all the bytecodes. And if that bytecode is	
13	in that table, then and active it could be in	
14	the table, but is deactivated. But if it's in a	
15	table and active, then the technique is in use. If	2:43PM
16	it's not if it's not in a table at all, it's for	
17	certain not there. If it's in a table, one would	
18	have to make sure it's actually invoked, but that	
19	would be fairly easy.	
20	Q Okay.	2:43PM
21	And you testified that the use of this	
22	snippet technique that's described in the '205	
23	patent was discontinued in the HotSpot Virtual	
24	Machine, correct?	
25	A I believe that's correct.	2:43PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 12 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 180
1	Q Why was it discontinued?	2:43PM
2	A Because when you have a system where you	
3	both have an interpreter, but also a compiler or a	
4	JIT, then the benefit of having snippets is unclear	
5	and maybe actually counterproductive because of the	2:43PM
6	complexity it introduces into the system.	
7	Q Okay.	
8	And what experience did you have or	
9	what what happened during the time period that	
10	the snippet technique was in use in the HotSpot	2:44PM
11	Virtual Machine that led you to conclude that it was	
12	not beneficial?	
13	A I believe we had measurements that show it	
14	didn't make a difference.	
15	Q Okay.	2:44PM
16	Did you have	
17	When you say you say you had	
18	measurements that it didn't make a difference, are	
19	you saying you had measurements that there was no	
20	improvement of performance or that any improvement	2:44PM
21	of performance was offset by the cost of having it	
22	in there in the first place?	
23	A I don't recall, but they seem to be the	
24	same at the end of the day, yeah.	
25	Q Okay.	2:44PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 13 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 181
1	And during your testimony with Mr. Jacobs,	2:44PM
2	you referred several times and again, I just want	
3	to make sure your testimony is clear to a	
4	layperson you talked about the cost of something,	
5	doing something in a program, and you also talked	2:45PM
6	about overhead.	
7	Could you explain what those two concepts	
8	are when you use them in terms of the performance of	
9	a virtual machine?	
10	A So this is all about making programs run	2:45PM
11	faster.	
12	And so by cost, one usually refers to, in	
13	this context, the extra time it takes to run a	
14	program. So if it takes more time, then it means	
15	that there is an extra cost.	2:45PM
16	Overhead goes into the same direction.	
17	Implementing the snippets causes some extra	
18	machinery to be executed, which one might casually	
19	refer to as overhead. So if that overhead is not	
20	offset by performance gains that are at least as	2:45PM
21	large, then you end up with an extra cost at the	
22	end.	
23	Q Okay.	
24	And again, just on these different	
25	techniques that we talked about make sure we're	2:46PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 14 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 182
1	clear the snippet technique you felt was	2:46PM
2	something new that you came up with, correct?	
3	A That Lars and I came up with.	
4	Q In-line caching was old and known and	
5	people had been doing for quite some time?	2:46PM
6	A That is correct.	
7	Q Is the same true of on-stack replacement?	
8	A I don't recall when on-stack replacement	
9	was introduced the first time. It may have been at	
10	Animorphic.	2:46PM
11	Q How about use of a just-in-time compiler?	
12	Was that something that was new with Animorphic?	
13	A No.	
14	Q That had been done for many years before	
15	that?	2:46PM
16	A In fact, we had a paper that referred to	
17	it.	
18	Q Now, during the time that you were at Sun	
19	from approximately February of 1997 until November	
20	of 2001, right, that was your time at Sun?	2:47PM
21	A Yes.	
22	Q Were you familiar with the different	
23	virtual machines that were being offered by Sun or	
24	any licensees of Sun?	
25	A I did not follow any of Sun's offerings.	2:47PM

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 15 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 183				
1	Q Okay.	2:47PM				
2	Were you familiar with the HotSpot Virtual					
3	Machine during that time period?					
4	A I was familiar because I was familiar with					
5	it in the past, but I have not followed its	2:47PM				
6	development.					
7	MR. JACOBS: I think you disconnected on					
8	that.					
9	MR. BABER: Yeah, I think we did, too.					
10	BY MR. BABER:	2:47PM				
11	Q I'm talking about during the time you were					
12	at Sun.					
13	A Oh, during the time at Sun. Okay.					
14	Of course I was familiar with the HotSpot					
15	Virtual Machine, yes.					
16	Q Were you also familiar, during that same					
17	time, with other virtual machines that were being					
18	developed or commercialized at Sun or by Sun's					
19	licensees?					
20	A I have heard of other virtual machines,	2:47PM				
21	yes.					
22	Q And during your time at Sun, you worked					
23	not just on the HotSpot Virtual Machine, but you					
24	worked on other Sun virtual machines for the Java					
25	language, correct?	2:48PM				
I						

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 16 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

		Page 184				
1	A I worked on that yeah, again, the	2:48PM				
2	virtual machine that was called casually Project					
3	Monty.					
4	Q Okay.					
5	To the best of your knowledge,	2:48PM				
6	Mr. Griesemer, during the time you were at Sun, did					
7	any virtual machine offered by Sun or commercialized					
8	by Sun in any way to any third party include use of					
9	the snippet technique that is described in your '205					
10	patent?	2:48PM				
11	A Again, I don't know when exactly it was					
12	removed, but to the best of my knowledge, no.					
13	Q Okay.					
14	Well, whenever the removal was, if the					
15	removal did occur at Sun, since the time it was	2:48PM				
16	removed, to the best of your knowledge, did any					
17	commercial product of Sun include the snippet					
18	technique?					
19	A I do believe no.					
20	MR. BABER: I don't have any other	2:49PM				
21	questions.					
22	FURTHER EXAMINATION					
23	BY MR. JACOBS:					
24	Q Just a few, Mr. Griesemer.					
25	A Sure.	2:49PM				

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 199-2 Filed 07/05/11 Page 17 of 18

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

				Page 188		
1	I, ROBERT GRI	ESEMER, do he	ereby declare u	under penalty of		
2	perjury that I have read the foregoing transcript; that					
3	I have made any corrections as appear noted, in ink,					
4	initialed by me; that my testimony as contained herein,					
5	as corrected,	is true and	correct.			
6	EXECUTED	this	day of	, 2011, at		
7		<i>r</i>	·			
8	(city)	(State)			
9						
10						
11						
12	-					
13		ROBERT	Γ GRIESEMER			
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

```
Page 189
     STATE OF CALIFORNIA
                                :ss
     COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO )
          I, KELLI COMBS, CSR No. 7705, a Certified Shorthand
 5
     Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:
          That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me
     at the time and place herein set forth; that any
     witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to
     testifying, were placed under oath; that the verbatim
10
     record of the proceedings was made by me using machine
11
     shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my
12
     direction; further, that the foregoing is an accurate
13
     transcription thereof.
14
          I further certify that I am neither financially
15
     interested in the action nor a relative or employee of
16
     any attorney of any of the parties.
17
          IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my
18
     name.
19
20
          Dated: June 27, 2011
21
22
23
24
                          KELLI COMBS, CSR No. 7705
25
```